

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by the Department of Classical Languages at Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 8, Missouri. Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at the Saint Louis, Missouri, Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME 32

MARCH 1956

NUMBER 5

Guest-Friendship and Development of Plot in Greek Tragedy

"Guest-friend" is an English word coined to translate a Greek and Latin term for which there is no English equivalent. In Greek the word is *ξένος*, and it refers in a very special way to a person associated with another by ties of hospitality. The relationship existing between guest and host, as understood by this word, was held in the highest regard in the ancient world as far back as the time of Homer. In Greek tragedy, too, allusions to this social custom appear,¹ and in five of the extant plays the guest-friend relationship is used with great effectiveness in the development of plot. Commentators have not been entirely unaware of this element in the structure of these plays, but most of them seem to have overlooked its importance.

The first of these five plays to claim our attention is the *Hecuba* of Euripides. In this play the general attitude of the Greeks toward guest-friendship is clearly shown, and a violation of the sacred rights of hospitality together with the retribution which comes to the offender forms an essential role in the development of its plot. Polydorus, the youngest son of Priam and Hecuba, had been entrusted many years before, along with rich treasures of gold, to the care of Polymestor, king of Thrace, that he might be safe from the dangers of war. Polymestor had been regarded as a *ξένος* to whom the king and queen of Troy might confidently entrust the last hope of their family (80-82). But now that the war was over, Polymestor slew the young man, threw his body into the sea, and seized the wealth which he had brought with him. It so happened, however, that the corpse was washed ashore near the place where the Greeks with their captives of war were encamped, awaiting fair weather to return home, and it was seen by Hecuba. As she looked upon the uncovered corpse and recognized it as that of her son, she felt sure that the boy had met with foul play at the hand of her guest-friend (710-711). The chorus inquire whether the motive of the murder could have been to get possession of his property (712), and Hecuba, without giving a direct reply, cries out against the unspeakable nature of the crime, calling it unholy and intolerable; and she asks where justice for guest-friends can be found (714).

In this issue . . .

Guest-Friendship and Development of Plot in Greek Tragedy Graydon W. Regenos 49
Sermonizing Our Brothers in English

A. M. Withers 53

In Ourselves, Not in Our Stars Editorial 54
Some Thoughts on the Sublime

Donald Devine, S.J. 55

Breviora: Letter to the Editor on Oxford Report (D. L. Page, page 57). Sophrona of the *Phormio* (Leo Max Kaiser, page 57). APA and AIA Elections in 1955 (page 57). Continuing Signs of Archaeological Interest (page 57). Interscholastic Latin Contest, 1955 (page 57).

Book Reviews: Mario Untersteiner, *The Sophists* (Phillip DeLacy, page 58). Minnie Lee Barrett Shepard, *Life in the Imperial and Loyal City of Mexico in New Spain, and the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico* (Raymond Victor Schoder, S.J., page 58). Charles Christopher Mierow, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, by Otto of Freising and His Continuator, Rahewin* (Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J., page 58). Sister Mary Donald, B.V.M., *Selections from Ecclesiastical Latin* (Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J., page 58). Gisela M. A. Richter, *Greek Portraits* (David Moore Robinson, page 58). Robert Muth, *Träger der Lebenskraft* (M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J., page 59). Three Books on Antiquities: William A. Smith, *Ancient Education*. W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Clement Robichon and Alexandre Varille, *Eternal Egypt* (M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J., page 59).

Materials Available through the Office of THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN 60

Polymestor's Sin in the "Hecuba"

Agamemnon then appears; and seeing Hecuba overcome with grief he inquires into the reason for her renewed sorrow. She explains that she has lost her youngest son, emphasizing at the same time the fact that he has been slain by a guest-friend. She pleads with Agamemnon to help her seek vengeance (789-805). Agamemnon shows himself sympathetic and desirous of helping her, and yet he considers that Polydorus was in reality an enemy of his own people, while Polymestor is actually his friend, and he argues that it will be difficult for him to reverse his attitude with regard to them without being misunderstood by his fellow citizens. Then, however, Hecuba determines to mete out vengeance on Polymestor herself, with her own Trojan women to assist her, and she begs Agamemnon to delay the burial of her daughter, Polyxena, whose sacrificial death had been the subject of the first part of the play, so that both her children may share a common tomb. Agamemnon voices no objection.

Hecuba accordingly sends a servant to bring the Thracian guest-friend, and after a choral interlude Polymestor is brought before her with his two small sons and a bodyguard. They are lured into the tent on the pretext that jewels from Troy are to be given to them for safekeeping. In a moment cries are heard inside as Polymestor is blinded and his sons slain by the Trojan women. Hecuba then returns and calmly describes to the chorus the deed and points to the victim as he comes forth deploring his dreadful fate. Though he must have presented a pitiful sight, he receives no comfort from the chorus, for they see in his punishment the hand of divine judgment. And when he attempts to justify his actions in the presence of Agamemnon, Hecuba, with cold logic, reveals the motive of his crime, emphasizing in particular the guest-friend relationship which had been violated (1214-1216). She then turns to Agamemnon and warns him that he will prove himself a sinful man if he assists this impious host (1233-1235). The chorus observe that eloquence is on the side of truth, and Agamemnon thus presents the Greek point of view:

But,—wouldst thou know my thought,—not for my sake,
Nor the Achaeans', didst thou slay thy guest,
But even to keep that gold within thine halls.
In this ill plight thou speak'st to serve thine ends.
Haply with you guest-murder is as nought,
But to us which be Greeks foul shame is this.
How can I uncondemned adjudge thee guiltless?
I cannot. Forasmuch as thou hast dared
To do foul deeds, even drain thy bitter cup (1243-1251).²

Polymestor, therefore, although a national ally, gains strong condemnation from the Greek chieftain for violating the laws of hospitality against the Trojan youth.

Place of ξένοι in the "Choephoroi"

The plot of each of the Electra plays is built around an intrigue involving pretended guest-friendship. The *Choephoroi*, as Mr. Harsh observes,³ "is the first extant play to contain an intrigue of the type which later became so popular." This intrigue involves the admittance of Orestes and his friend Pylades to the royal household to facilitate the murder of Orestes' mother and her paramour. The scheme, in short, is that Orestes and Pylades will present themselves at the door of the palace as guest and ally (562). The words used here are ξένοις and δογύξενος. The exact meaning of the latter is disputed, but the context clearly indicates that these young men will take advantage of the welcome accorded to guests in order to gain admittance thereby to the palace. And if perchance they do not at once receive hospitable treatment, they resolve to remain outside the door, so that passersby may take note and wonder why it is that Aegisthus is closing his door to suppliants.

It is important to observe at this point that such a ruse could hope to be successful only in a society

which held in almost superstitious regard the stranger who came to the door seeking hospitality. Slight chance would a pair of unidentified travelers have today of gaining admittance to a royal palace. Yet so strong was the feeling in antiquity that the stranger should not be turned away, but graciously received, that a more plausible scheme of gaining access to the presence of the queen and her paramour can hardly be imagined.

Accordingly, Orestes and Pylades approach the palace door and knock. Orestes calls to those within to come out, adding by way of mild approach, "if by Aegisthus' will it offers welcome to strangers" (656). A servant answers the door. Orestes asks to see the mistress or, better still, the master. Clytaemnestra soon appears, courteously addresses the two young men as ξένοι, and gives them a hearty welcome (668-673).

Orestes then introduces himself as a Daulian from Phocis. He says that he has come to Argos on personal business, and that en route he had met a fellow-countryman who requested him to bear to Orestes' parents the news of his death, and to inquire what disposal should be made of the remains. Orestes pretends not to know that he has actually come to the right house. Clytaemnestra, with concealed hypocrisy, voices momentarily, though with cold restraint, the feelings of a true mother, and Orestes hastens to apologize for bringing this sad report. "For myself," he says, "I am sure, with hosts so prosperous, I had rather been made known and welcomed by reason of good tidings. For where is good-will greater than from guest to host? Yet to my thought it had been a breach of sacred duty not to fulfill for friends a charge like this when I was bound by promise and by hospitality pledged to me" (700-706). Clytaemnestra assures Orestes that he is no less welcome on that account, for otherwise it would have been necessary for another to bring the message. She then bids an attendant to escort the strangers into the men's quarters and show them every kindness.

Meanwhile, Clytaemnestra sends a servant, Orestes' former nurse, to summon Aegisthus. Although the poor old woman is crushed by the report of Orestes' death and knows full well that the news she must bear to Aegisthus will fill him with joy, she is obliged to carry out the orders of her mistress. Ironically enough, however, she actually becomes the instrument for bringing Aegisthus to his doom, for he is immediately murdered on his arrival at the palace. Clytaemnestra now realizes that she and Aegisthus are perishing, victims of her son's guile.

Here, as will be seen in the other plays on this theme, there is no indication whatsoever that the laws of hospitality have been violated. The retribution which begins immediately to overtake Orestes

is for the
the inher
of hospi
the laws

In the
the devi

Clytaem
through
rives wi
(16), fo
his fath
old serv
is to ex
father.

armed f
provides
door as
the you
chariot
come be
claim, t
accordi
men of
is in tu
plausibi
Orestes
taemne
it woul
strange
go awa
Thro
charge
that El
for to
after l
dresses
them i
does t
she sh

Sho
slay C
heard
where
tra te
appar
law a
heart
Her
the p
and it
Eu
for th
pect,
Whe
and l

is for the murder of his mother and perhaps to fulfill the inherited curse, not for the violation of the rights of hospitality. Indeed, he has not actually violated the laws of hospitality; he has merely pretended.

The "Electra" of Sophocles

In the *Electra* of Sophocles, as in the *Choephoroi*, the device used by Orestes and Pylades to deceive Clytaemnestra and to gain access to the palace is through a pretence of guest-friendship. Orestes arrives with Pylades, whom he calls dearest of hosts (16), for Orestes had been a guest in the house of his father in Phocis, and along with them comes an old servant, to fulfill the injunction of Apollo that he is to execute judgment on the murderers of his own father. The Pythian god has advised the use not of armed force but of guile. The plan as worked out provides that the old servant approach the palace door as a Phocian stranger and falsely report that the young Orestes has been accidentally killed in a chariot race. In due time Orestes and Pylades will come bearing an urn containing, as they will falsely claim, the ashes of the dead Orestes. The old man, accordingly, approaches Clytaemnestra and the women of the chorus and addresses them as ξένοι. He is in turn addressed as ξένος. After narrating, with plausible fulness of detail, the circumstances of Orestes' pretended death, he turns to go, but, Clytaemnestra insists that he remain, for she feels that it would be disgraceful to herself as well as to the stranger who sent him, if she should permit him to go away.

Throughout the recognition scene which follows, charged as it is with strong dramatic irony, we note that Electra applies to Orestes the appellation ξένος, for to her he is truly a stranger-guest. And even after Electra has learned his identity she still addresses him and Pylades as ξένοι, as she invites them into the palace; but now, we may suppose, she does this to help carry out the deception, in case she should be overheard.

Shortly after their entrance into the palace they slay Clytaemnestra; and then Aegisthus, having heard the rumor of Orestes' death, comes to inquire where these Phocian strangers may be found. Electra tells him that they are inside, and then with apparent ambiguity adds, as Jebb following Whitelaw aptly translates, "They have found a way to the heart of their hostess" (1451).

Here too there seems to be no question concerning the propriety of the means of deception employed, and it even has the sanction of Apollo.

Euripides uses the act of hospitality to strangers for the development of plot, but, as one might expect, he works out the details in a different manner. When Electra first comes face to face with Orestes and his companion, she is frightened, for she fears

that these strangers have come to do her harm. She is on the point of rushing into the house, and she urges the chorus to follow, but Orestes begs her to remain and not be afraid. Electra addresses him as ξένος, which in this context must be understood to mean "stranger"; but when her peasant husband returns and inquires who these strangers are and mildly chides her for being found in their company, she tenderly replies:

O kindest heart, do not suspect me thou,
And thou shalt hear the truth. These strangers come
Heralds to me of tidings of Orestes.
And, O ye strangers, pardon these his words (345-348).

Euripides' Variant Use of the Institution

Upon further questioning the peasant convinces himself of their good intentions and warmly welcomes them (357-359). Orestes discourses briefly on the blessings of honest poverty, and then immediately orders his attendants to enter the lowly cottage, remarking that he would rather receive the kind hospitality of a poor man than of the rich (394-395). As the strangers withdraw into the cottage, Electra questions their ability to entertain such noble guests (404-405). The peasant, however, reasons that if these men are, as they seem, really noble-born, they will be satisfied, no matter whether their fare is large or small (406-407). Electra then bids her husband fetch from the country an old servant with provisions for entertaining these guests; and the peasant, after expressing the wish that he had better means for the purpose, sets out on his errand.

The old servant is presently introduced into the action of the play and has a highly important role in the development of the plot, for he soon brings about the positive identification of Orestes and offers the plan of action which will result in the slaying of Aegisthus. The plan is simply that Orestes shall pass in full view of the king as he is in the act of preparing a feast in honor of the Nymphs. He can expect to be invited to share in the feast, and he will thereby be given an opportunity to kill the usurper. Electra, on the other hand, proposes to develop and carry out independently a scheme to murder Clytaemnestra, but her plan in no way calls for deception involving guest-friendship.

In due time Orestes successfully executes his plan, and a messenger comes to report the detail. Aegisthus, we learn, has been duped through his kindness to strangers. And so, again, it can be seen that too much trust in the good faith of supposed strangers has served as the motivating force in the successful execution of an intrigue.

Distinctiveness of the "Alcestis"

There remains one further play for consideration, the *Alcestis* of Euripides. No other Greek tragedy seems to demonstrate better the Athenian attitude

toward hospitality. Indeed, the development of the plot which leads to the final restoration of Alcestis from death is motivated almost entirely by Admetus' strong conviction that nothing must stand in the way of hospitable treatment to a guest. Harsh¹ recognizes the importance of this guest-friend relationship and says that it seems undeniable "that this characteristic of Admetus, at once his weakness and his salvation, is one of the moral motivations of the play."

Not until the appearance of Heracles, which takes place about half way through the drama, does Admetus have occasion to display his scrupulous regard for guests. In the prologue, however, a prediction had been made by Apollo to Death that a man would come as a guest to Admetus' palace and would rescue Alcestis from Death's grasp (65-69), a reference, of course, to the coming of Heracles. When the hero finally does arrive (477), Alcestis has already suffered her vicarious death, but she has not yet been buried. Heracles is totally unaware that he is entering a house of mourning, and his coming at this time is made to appear quite coincidental. Admetus presently comes forth and warmly greets his guest, but is unable to conceal his grief. He is evasive, however, and pretends that the deceased is neither his wife nor any other member of his immediate family. Heracles, displaying better manners than usual, says that he will continue on his way to the house of some other friend, for he does not wish to be a burden to a house in mourning. Admetus, however, insists that he stay and instructs his servants to find quarters for him beyond the sound of weeping, and to provide him with plenty of food.

As Heracles is being conducted away, the chorus question Admetus' strange behavior, but he explains his hospitable treatment to Heracles as follows:

But had I driven him from my home and city
Who came my guest, then hadst thou praised me more?
Nay verily: mine affliction so had grown
No less, and more inhospitable were I!
And to mine ills were added this beside,
That this my home were called "Guest-hating Hall."
Yea, and myself have proved him kindest host
Whene'er to Argos' thirsty plain I fared (553-560).

The chorus then inquire why he has not revealed the true cause of his grief. He explains that Heracles would never have set foot in the door if he had known the real circumstances. "Mine halls have not learnt To thrust away nor to dishonour guests," he says (566-567). The chorus praise this hospitality and comment on the number of guests he has in his house. First, Apollo came; and now with moist eye he has opened wide his home to another guest, they observe.

After a choral passage, the funeral procession appears. Pheres, the aged father of Admetus, brings funeral gifts and offers belated sympathy and condolence. Admetus' scrupulous observance of the

rights of hospitality is here thrown into sharp relief against a background of devastating rebuke which he now hurls at his father.

Heracles, as we have seen, had been turned over to the care of the servants to be given the best of accommodations. Presently one of the servants returns and bewails the ravages on the kitchen perpetrated by this gluttonous visitor (747-750). He calls Heracles "a lawless thief, a bandit rogue" (766), and finally asks: "Do I not well To loathe this guest, intruder on our griefs?" (771-772) Now Heracles has sensed a peculiar coolness on the part of the servants; and when he finds this servant brooding over the state of affairs, he is resentful and rebukes him (773-775). He had been told that the dead was alien-born, and he can therefore see no reason for such a spirit of dejection in the house. Could he be deceived? No, the servant assures him that his master is exceedingly fond of guests. Then why this unpleasant reception? The servant finally reveals the truth, explaining that the corpse is none other than that of Admetus' wife. Heracles, at first skeptical, is at last convinced and sees in Admetus a true friend, a real lover of guests (830, 858). Out of gratitude for his welcome he resolves to bring Alcestis back from the dead and deliver her into her husband's hands (853-855).

Admetus' act of reverence to a guest is therefore richly rewarded, and we can clearly see in Heracles' parting words to Admetus, henceforth to reverence his guests, that proper respect for the sacred rights of hospitality is undoubtedly, as Harsh points out, "one of the moral motivations of the play."

Thus in the five Greek tragedies here considered there seems to be little doubt that the chief motivation in the denouement of plot has in each case rested upon the guest-friend relationship, a concept fully understood and appreciated by the theater audience of ancient Athens, but largely unknown in the modern world. A recognition of the importance which the ancients attached to this social custom seems highly significant for a better understanding of these plays.

Graydon W. Regenos

Tulane University

NOTES

¹ See my article, "Guest-Friendship in Greek Tragedy," *CB* 31 (March 1955) 49-51, 52, 55-56. ² Throughout this paper translations are from the *Loeb Classical Library*. The translator for Aeschylus is Herbert Weir Smyth (2 vols.: London and New York 1922-1926); for Sophocles, F. Storr (2 vols.: London and New York 1912-1913); and for Euripides, Arthur S. Way (4 vols.: London and New York 1912-1920). ³ Philip W. Harsh, *A Handbook of Classical Drama* (Stanford 1944) 75. ⁴ *Ibid.* 171.

Sic ista dicendi celeritas nec in sua potestate est nec satis decora philosophiae, quae ponere debet verba, non proicere, et pedetemptim procedere.—Sen. *Ep.* 40.7.

Sermonizing Our Brothers in English

The worst of all lukewarm beholders of Latin are educational officials (college presidents, deans, registrars, student advisers) who once studied it, but for whatever reason did not "make a go" of it. The need of bending their necks to details that did not seem to them in their green youth significant or to build prospects of early material success, bored their spirits. Looking back, they feel that they would have done better following purely English lines of far less resistance. The thought has hardened in their minds with the passing years. They sympathize with all the activities of the English department, while leaving Latin to recede into a dark background with other items declared unessential to a general education. The English professors, in their turn, gladly accept the preferred position thus given them in the limelight, and rarely if ever mention Latin in the hearing of their students.

Now I love English and instructors in English. The latter are hard put to it in these twilight-of-English days (in spite of executive help), and the fact represses to some extent my "noble rage." Many English professors, particularly in graduate departments, do indeed strive for alliance of the languages for the common good, and, urging Latin, in some degree take part in its battles.

Necessary Alliance of "Language" and "Literature"

My quarrel is only with those who forsake the responsibility for keeping *language*, equally with *literature*, in the forefront of their purposes. I disagree violently with the instructors of English who turn their classes, for diversion and pedagogical "bang" (to use the expression of one of their number), into discussions of art, theology, psychology, sociology, love and marriage, and so on, because they lack vision or stamina for the eternal values in plain work on fundamentals, for the straight routine that honest improvement in knowledge of English and general taste in language demands.

Some professors of English, to explain their lack of militancy in supporting Latin, belabor the classicists of a not very distant period for alleged blindness to the course of nature and the needs of a new generation; for dehumanizing, as they say, the humanities by excess of grammar drill and insufficiency of zeal for literary and historical glory and grandeur.

Charge Against Older Classicists

Note the interesting remark of Professor T. H. English, in an address to the South Atlantic division of the Modern Language Association (1946):

The earlier generation that deserted the classics did so because teachers of the classics failed to convince their students that the classics contain the wisdom and the joy of life. . . . Or, as I read the record, the student asked for ideas, and their teachers gave them grammar.

I would "talk back" to these critics. Surely it is an unwarranted thing to accuse a whole profession of the fell crime of killing with grammar. Is it not rational to say that former professors of the classics were like the professors of other fields, that they were a very mixed assemblage, that some undoubtedly paid too little attention to psychological principles in teaching the young, that some in effect dried up in their professional sanctums, but that the profession as a body retained its intellectual human soundness and common sense?

Fallacy of Sweeping Blame

There is a general tendency, it seems, on the part of the human family, quickly to forget, and often to misrepresent things and people that have gone not so very far before. The First World War is now history to most people much in the same sense as the war of the Revolution. The Second World War is already fading into some sort of distance. The "nineties" have been catalogued as "gay." But we who lived through them, or close to them, know that the solemn brood of care plodded along then almost if not quite precisely as now. We do well to be filled with a deep distrust when some people package up our comparatively short American language past in order to interpret it to their own advantage and aggrandizement, and to the discredit of the old devoted guard of classicists.

A. M. Withers

Department of English and Foreign Languages,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blackburg, Virginia

The Homeric women . . . are essentially feminine, without being insipid or inane; their sphere is the home; their occupation is in the ministries of wife and mother, of sister and daughter; and in everything that Homer shows us of their relations, we recognize a natural warmth of domestic affections and a noble tone of manners.—Sir Richard C. Jebb, *The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry*.

Apart from Homer there is no Greek poet <other than Theocritus> whose every page is so crowded with literary associations. This is, of course, partly due to Vergil's close imitations in the *Eclogues*, but more than one famous Horatian tag, more than one familiar line of Catullus was anticipated by Theocritus, while a list of the reminiscences of the *Idylls* in the English poets would fill many pages.—Wilmer Cave Wright, *A Short History of Greek Literature*.

Of Theocritus it may be said, with emphasis rarely in place, that he has picked his readers and admirers, and they have been among the choice spirits of the earth.—Robert Thomas Kerlin, *Theocritus in English Literature*.

The Classical Bulletin

Published by the Department of Classical Languages
at Saint Louis University

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

William Charles Korfmacher.....	Editor
M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Chauncey Edgar Finch.....	Associate Editor
Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Francis Charles Hunleth, S.J.....	Associate Editor

Address: 3647 West Pine Boulevard, Saint Louis 8, Missouri
Subscription: \$2.00 per year. Single copies: 40c. To members
of the ACL, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, and CAPS, \$1.60 per
year, through the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer of each
of these organizations.

Concerning subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, adver-
tising, and the like, please address the Editor. Concerning
manuscripts for possible publication, address any member
of the Committee.

Volume 32 March 1956 Number 5

E D I T O R I A L

In Ourselves, Not in Our Stars

One of the most striking and instructive documents on the threat to national security and well-being comes to us in some well chosen words by Solon of Athens, writing in the early sixth century before Christ. Declaring (*frag.* 3 Diehls) that the city of Athens would never fall "by the destiny of Zeus or the desire of the blessed gods," he develops the theme that internal unconcern and wickedness are the true threats to the continuing civic health of the state, and includes in his elegiac verses the following admonitory couplet (lines 5-6):

αὐτοὶ δὲ φθείρειν μεγάλην πόλιν ἀφραδίησιν
ἄστοι βούλονται χρήμασι πειθόμενοι—

Nay, but the burghers themselves would ruin the might
of their city,
As they in dullness of heart hearken to lucre's appeal.

These are salutary words—for any state, and especially for any democratic state, where national wit and will must ultimately be measured by the intelligence and purpose of the electorate. They are therefore timely to us in these days of educational crisis, particularly on the level of college training, as we reexamine and examine again what we consider the best content of higher education to be.

Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, speaking in Saint Louis on February 3 of this year before members of the local Princeton Club (as subsequently reported in the *Saint Louis Globe-Democrat* on the following day), pungently remarked that "The future of America is tied to the health and prosperity of the liberal arts way of life." Further, says the report, "he . . . pointed out that society must constantly be infused with those values of human nature that set man above animals. This, he said, is the purpose of the liberal arts school."

These are no new concepts, but they gain newness and significance in an era of a questioning as to educational goals, and of a genuine concern for the nation's safety and stability. Any man sanely convinced of the values of liberal arts training could cite at length its advantages, intangible though these may seem to be. But it is well in our public relations as liberal arts proponents to rethink those advantages in terms of the contemporary scene and to expound the fundamental "usefulness" of what many consider a "useless" training. For surely the continuing security of America is admittedly "useful" in the highest degree.

"Mass education," adds the report of the address by Mr. Dodds, "and liberal education are contradictions," he said, and then added that the purpose of the liberal arts college is 'not to educate masses but individuals.' And as this emphasis on the perfecting of the individual is the very soul of liberal arts training, so it reaches into the very soul of a democratic state. For, once again, the security of such a state must be measured by the intelligence and purpose of the electorate. We may look for a wiser and a saner nation in proportion to the increasing number of those who can think soundly and will rightly.

The disharmony, of course, between "mass education" and "liberal education" in no sense means that the masses should not be educated, and Mr. Dodds wisely denies the implication "of trying to form an intellectual elite." In a democracy, it is the very salvation of the state that more and more should be grounded in the rudiments of liberal arts training. And the achievement of that goal is one of the greatest challenges that the liberal arts college has ever faced.

For to educate as individuals more and more students—Mr. Dodds predicts that in twenty years "the present college enrollment of 2,500,000 will grow to about 6,000,000"—even though many of those coming to college will be primarily interested in technical and largely scientific programs, will mean extraordinary and heroic efforts by college teaching faculties and administrations.

Yet the task is one that can be done; and the gains will be many—not the least of them being a rescue of America from the perils of an unschooled electorate, weak and wavering in its moral purpose.

—W. C. K.

Hoc denique tibi circa mortis diem praesta,
morianatur ante te vitia.—Sen. *Ep.* 27.2.

He <Horace> is one of the few ancient writers who unite all the cultivated nations of modern times in a common admiration.—W. Y. Sellar, *Horace and the Elegiac Poets.*

Some Thoughts on the Sublime

The anonymous author whom we call Longinus was a Greek of the first century A.D. His only extant work is written on style and criticism, *De Sublimitate* (*περὶ ὑψους*). This treatise has been called, "the greatest contribution of the Greeks, after the *Poetics*, to the study of their own literature,"¹ and Longinus has been labeled, "the most modern of the ancient critics."²

Although we cannot be certain what Longinus meant by the word *ὑψος*, Sikes proposes an interesting theory. "In English, the word <sublime> is doubly unfortunate. In the first place, 'the sublime' in popular language suggests ideas rather than form. . . . Secondly, the term is not wide enough. . . . The various words used by Longinus, as more or less equivalent to *ὑψος* and its adjective *ὑψηλός* all connote distinction or elevation; and if the name of the book were not fixed by tradition, we might best convey its character by the title, *On great writing*."³

Definition and Effect of Sublime

When joined to loftiness of mind and expression according to certain fixed rules, this quality, elevation, produces the effect of sublime literature, *ἔκστασις*. "The influence of the sublime," as Roberts translated, "imposes power and irresistible might, and reigns supreme over every hearer."⁴ Thus, when reading a piece of sublime literature, we should have an emotional movement, accompanied by an interior excitement. A further meaning of the word would be a distraction accompanied by a loss of self control, but we cannot be sure that Longinus would have gone that far.

Only the truly sublime can elevate the soul, can transport it. If a piece of literature becomes more pleasing and enjoyable each time we read it and continues to delight us after close analysis, then it deserves the title of sublime. "Consider those examples of sublimity worthy of the name if they are pleasing to all men in all generations. For when men of different occupations, lives, ambitions, ages, and languages hold the same opinions on a single subject . . . , their verdict makes our faith in the object of admiration strong and unassailable."⁵ Longinus would have us apply the tests of internal complexity, time, and emotional enjoyment in order to decide upon truly sublime literature. In applying these three tests, however, Longinus warns us to look upon the work as a whole. He draws a comparison to the collocation of members of the human body. If one is severed from the other, it possesses nothing remarkable in itself, but altogether they make a perfect organism. This is what is commonly called the "organic" approach today.

At this point in the treatise, Longinus suggests the sources of elevated style. They are, first, the ability

to form great conceptions for "sublimity is the echo of a great soul."⁶ This ability comes from acquaintance with, and appreciation of, the great authors, Homer and Demosthenes. "For it is impossible that men with mean and lowly ideas and aims prevailing throughout their lives should produce anything that is truly worthy of immortality."⁷ Secondly, inspired passion is required. Thirdly, the writer should use figures of thought and expression. Noble diction is the fourth requirement; and, finally, elevated composition is also necessary.

Directives for Elevated Style

These five directives serve as a foundation indispensable to elevated style. Yet we may ask, will one necessarily attain the aesthetic effect of sublimity, *ἔκστασις*, by simply following these practical suggestions? If it were necessary only to observe these hints of Longinus, everyone would be able to write in an elevated style by simple adherence to rules. We know that this is not the case. An aesthetic effect can not be guaranteed, can not be achieved, by simply observing practical advice.

With these rules, though, Longinus starts out on a new path, in a direction different from that of Plato, Aristotle, and even Horace. Plato said that the source of what Longinus would call sublime poetic composition is *μανία*, inspired frenzy. For just as the Sibyl and the Delphic priestesses prophesy only when they are inspired, so, "any man that comes to the gates of poetry without the madness of the Muses, persuaded that skill alone will make him a good poet . . . , will be brought to nought by the poetry of madness" (*Phdr.* 245a).

Aristotle in his *Poetica* seems to go to the opposite extreme, as he develops mainly the idea of form in poetry. But while he does not explicitly stress the psychological source of poetry, his understanding of poetry as a unique imitation of the real, more philosophic than history, implies what was later to be elaborated as the creative imagination. Horace, although he is more superficial than Plato and Aristotle, seems to have attained the happy medium, the *aurea mediocritas*, between Plato and Aristotle, when he says that poetry is a combination of natural ability and hard work (*Ars P.* 409-411).

Perfection or Sublimity

While agreeing with Horace that great literature is a combination of inspiration and form, Nature and Art, Longinus seems to stress a natural ability; this must, however, be assisted and not hindered by the rules of Art. For nature must come first, but it should not act at random or without a definite method. For while, "it is true that nature often needs the spur, it is also true that it also needs the curb."⁸

Besides this new approach to the necessity of uniting Nature and Art, the question of stylistic perfection, which is still a problem warmly debated today, was a concern to Longinus. Should a poet prefer to attain grandeur of elevated style with occasional faults, or moderate success which is free from all error? "It is true that Apollonius is a poet who does not trip, and Theocritus, except in a few externals, is most successful, and yet would you choose to be Apollonius rather than Homer?"⁹ Longinus admits that Homer has blundered, as well as Plato and Demosthenes, but they have done so only occasionally. Of course, the faults of even those great writers displease him, but, while freedom from errors relieves from censure, it is grandeur that excites admiration."¹⁰

Longinus would have us strive for sublimity rather than simple perfection of form and freedom from error, because this grandeur of sublime literature attains *ἐξοχαις* in certain passages, even though this emotional movement is not sustained throughout. Those, however, who never run the risk of failing in striving for sublimity, never attain the true purpose of poetry. We should try, therefore, to imitate and equal writers such as Homer, and even though we fail, "this strife is good for mortals."¹¹

Longinus on Homer

What Sikes calls Longinus' "intuitive wisdom" is easily seen in his theory on Homer. The *Iliad*, according to Longinus, would naturally have been written first, while Homer was still a young man, because in this book he describes wars and deeds of bravery, which are the main interests of a young man. In his poetry he makes the battles be fought again and, "he shows the full inspiration of combat."¹²

The *Odyssey*, however, was for Longinus a collection of many marvelous tales, the creation of an old man's imagination. The mourning and lament for the dead heroes of the Trojan War is offered as an added proof that the *Odyssey* was written by Homer after the *Iliad*.¹³ Longinus considers the travels of Odysseus an inferior work, without the passion, imagery, and sustained interest of the *Iliad*. He compares it to a setting sun, whose grandeur remains without its intensity. Yet, even though the whole poem is a fantasy of old age, "it is still the old age of Homer."¹⁴

Importance of Longinus

Now that we have noted some of the high lights of Longinus' treatise, we can see why J. W. H. Atkins could say, "that there is an abundance of good things in the treatise . . . , enough to warrant its inclusion among the choicest pieces of criticism that have reached posterity."¹⁵ If we remember that we have

not received many treatises on criticism from antiquity, and that this selection of Longinus stands out as the only large-scale critical effort in Greek after Aristotle, we do well to accept the statement. And while most of the ideas about the sublime are considered common sense today, we should remember how long ago he wrote, and how few men have even attempted to treat of this subject in such detail.

Still, the basis of the treatise might be considered a fallacy if we understand Longinus to have prescribed his rules as a certain means of obtaining sublimity. I think that he intended to select the qualities which impressed him, and which he thought could be taught, while he was reading Homer and the other great Greek writers, to show us some of the means that they used in obtaining sublimity. In his arrangement of sources for elevated style, the first two places are given to ability to form great conceptions, and *inspired passion*. Since Nature and Art must be combined in a poet, we should look upon these five suggestions as a list of guides which may prove helpful if used correctly, rather than a promise of sublimity.

His original contributions, then, which are still important today, and which insure him a high place among the founders of literary criticism, are the fact that he stressed emotional elevation or *ἐξοχαις* as the purpose of literature; he combined the theories of Plato and Aristotle on the importance of both Nature and Art in sublimity; he stated that time and a deeper appreciation of the work upon close analysis are two important tests of great literature; he emphasized the importance of the organic approach in literature; and he holds up the high ideal of literature, that we should strive for sublimity, and no lesser goal.

Donald Devine, S.J.

Bellarmino College,
Plattsburg, New York

NOTES

- 1 E. E. Sikes, *The Greek View of Poetry* (London 1901) 207. 2 T. R. Henn, *Longinus and English Criticism* (Cambridge 1934) 1. 3 Sikes, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 1) 209. 4 On the *Sublime*, ed. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge 1899) 1.4. 5 *Subl.* 7.4. 6 *Ibid.* 9.2. 7 *Ibid.* 9.3. 8 *Ibid.* 2.3. 9 *Ibid.* 38.4. 10 *Ibid.* 36.1. 11 *Ibid.* 13.4. 12 *Ibid.* 9.11. 13 The Scottish critic Hugh Blair (d. 1800) in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (ed. Abraham Mills, Philadelphia, n.d.) 481-491, develops this viewpoint on Homer as his own, with a passing reference to Longinus. Most critics today agree, in any case, that the *Odyssey* is a later work. For Longinus' treatment of Homer, see Henrietta V. Apfel, *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius . . . and Longinus . . .* (Columbia University, New York 1935) 18-24, with the bibliography there cited. I owe these references to the Reverend Herbert Musurillo, S.J., with whom I have discussed this paper. 14 *Subl.* 9.14. 15 J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, 2 vols. (London 1952) II 217; and cf. also Moses Hadas, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York 1953) 236.

Letter to

Sir:
I should
corrected
Classical
32, Novem
and Page.

(1) "An

tion to sou

ical error

article in"

(2) "He

has been i

(3) "M

Alexander

the like."

to demon

and places

(4) "Hi

the feud

mobilizat

There wa

paper. T

Hittite E

the march

forgotten

battle of

are unitt

Hittite en

also the c

dent thro

to its diss

Trinity C

Cambridge

Editor

publish P

Professor

possible r

but in tw

That his

Times on

presumab

BULLETIN

letter" it

derived th

great Kir

historicit

definite i

(4) That

"pressed

porters, I

In the

role. Th

Lemnian,

champion

of her.

hence her

In her

pointing

the amic

more, as

Chremes

used at I

non obse

the horr

has two

quite so

solam.

effective

quite an

hunt ret

Here,

a minor

Loyola U

Breviora

Letter to the Editor on Oxford Conference Report

Sir:
I should be obliged if you would publish the following corrections of mis-statements in an article entitled "Joint Classical Conference at Oxford," THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN 32, November 1955, pp. 1-4, 7-8, under the section "Murray and Page."

(1) "An article in Beyces Sultan limited the possible position to southwestern Asia Minor."—This may be a typographical error: Beycesultan is a place, not a periodical; for "an article in" read "the excavation at."

(2) "He read an unpublished letter."—This celebrated letter has been in print for over thirty years.

(3) "Mr. Page believes in the historicity of Atreus, Eteocles, Alexander (Paris), and of the stories of Lesbos, Miletus, and the like."—Mr. Page devoted a considerable part of his time to demonstrating the exact opposite, viz. that these persons and places are *not* to be found in any historical document.

(4) "His theory will be demolished, especially the idea that the feudal Hittite Kings carried through a press-button mobilization of all Anatolia and remained independent."—There was nothing about "press-button" mobilization in his paper. There was a statement that "at a word from the Hittite Emperor, as much of Anatolia as he needs will be on the march": and this could only be denied by one who had forgotten (among other things) the list of contingents at the battle of Kadesh. The words "and remained independent" are unintelligible, perhaps another typographical error: the Hittite emperors not only "remained independent" but were also the cause of their neighbors failing to remain independent throughout the whole history of their New Empire down to its dissolution in Anatolia c. 1200 B.C.

Yours sincerely,

D. L. Page

Trinity College,
Cambridge—January 30, 1956

Editor's Note: THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN is happy to publish Professor Page's letter. In the interest of fairness, Professor Robinson was presented with the material, for a possible rejoinder. He prefers not to write a formal reply but in two letters (of February 5 and 6, 1956) remarks: (1) That his original manuscript had said "an article in the *Times* on Beyces Sultan"; through some error in copying, presumably, the manuscript submitted to THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN did not so read. (2) That on the "unpublished letter" item, the *London Times* report reads as follows: "He derived this opinion partly from an unpublished letter of the great King or Emperor of the Hittites." (3) That on the historicity of Atreus and the others he had carried off the definite impression that Mr. Page accepted them as historical. (4) That on the "press-button mobilization," he had been "pressed into using the word 'press-button' by fellow reporters. It was used in the *London Times* report."

Sophrona of the *Phormio*

In the *Phormio* of Terence, Sophrona has only a minor rôle. The old nurse of Chremes' daughter by his second, Lemnian, "wife," she is characterized by Geta (98-118) as a champion of the girl's virtue when Antipho becomes enamored of her. She emerges as a prudent, devoted "nanny," and hence her name.

In her only speaking part (728-765), however, it deserves pointing out that Terence has drawn her with a finer pen: the *amicula* is capable of a wonderful irony, and something more, as she speaks with the uxorious Chremes. Surely, after Chremes has begged that he be not addressed by the name he used at Lemnos, there is an underlying meaning in her words: *non obsecro es / quem semper te esse dictitasti?* And when the horrified Chremes inquires of her whether his nephew has two wives, Sophrona replies in freighted language, not quite so gently ironic: *au, obsecro, unam ille quidem hanc solam.* (One will note the *obsecro* in both passages most effectively employed). In her last words, Sophrona, now quite annoyed, I believe, deserts double meanings for the blunt retort: *nemo e me scibit.*

Here, as elsewhere, Terence can add delicate overtones to a minor character.

Leo Max Kaiser

Loyola University of Chicago

APA and AIA Elections in 1955

George Eckel Duckworth, Princeton University, was elected president of the American Philological Association at the Christmas meetings, December 28-30, 1955. Charles Bradford Welles, Yale University, was named *first vice-president*; and Gertrude Elizabeth Smith, The University of Chicago, *second vice-president*. Paul L. MacKendrick remains as *secretary-treasurer*. Francis Redding Walton, Florida State University, remains *editor of TAPA*. In the Archaeological Institute of America, personnel changes included the following: *treasurer*, Walter C. Baker (to December 31, 1958); *recorder*, Christine Alexander (to December 31, 1956); *elected members of the executive committee* (to December 31, 1958), Dudley E. Easby, Jr., and Casper J. Kraemer; *members of the board of trustees* (to December 31, 1958), Ward M. Canaday, Joseph B. Carrigan, Dudley T. Easby, Jr., and Hugh Hencken; in addition to the latter, Gustavus F. Swift, Jr. (to fill the unexpired term of the late Willard V. King, to December 31, 1957).

In the APA, Professor Ben Edward Perry, of the department of classics at the University of Illinois, was declared recipient of the fifth Annual Award of Merit, presented each year to the author of "an outstanding contribution to classical scholarship published by a member of the association before the end of the preceding calendar year." Mr. Perry's work was his *Aesopica*, first volume of the text and subsequent tradition of the fables ascribed to Aesop.

In the AIA, no editorial changes were announced, with the important exception that Professor Jotham Johnson, long associated with the *Newsletter* of the Institute, will within 1956 publish the last number of that organ. Present plans call for an inclusion of *Newsletter* material in *Archaeology*.

Continuing Signs of Archaeological Interest

The continuing indications of general reader interest in matters archaeological was strikingly illustrated in a single (and expanded) issue of the *Saint Louis Globe-Democrat*, on December 26, 1955, when four articles of such content appeared.

A Reuters dispatch from Nara, Japan, dated December 25, declared that a find of "treasures kept in an ancient Japanese imperial storehouse in Nara, near Osaka, included ornaments made from whale bones 1200 years ago." An Associated Press dispatch from New York, dated December 25, announced the availability of "a photo-copy of what is claimed to be the oldest known city map in history," through the work of Samuel N. K. Clark, research professor at the University of Pennsylvania. The map, found on a tablet excavated in 1899, is of Nippur, ancient cultural center of Sumer.

From Bonn, a Reuters dispatch, dated December 25, reported the discovery, near Bresinchen, in Brandenburg, East Germany, of a "bronze age merchants' storeroom about 3500 years old," containing "1003 bronze axes, one double-edged ax, 30 necklaces and 10 daggers." Finally, a Reuters dispatch from Rome, dated December 25, reported the unearthing, by "archaeologists digging at the site of the old city walls of Imola, in northeast Italy," of "a large mosaic floor, dating back to Roman times," its dimensions being "60 feet by 34 feet, in an intricate pattern of black and white tiles."

The constant appearance of such items in the daily press points not alone to a current renaissance in archaeological investigation, but to an enthusiastic response among many persons not at all specialists in the field. Among various reports since December 26, 1955, in such announcements, one of the most imagination-stirring is that from Bari, Italy, through the Associated Press, dated January 30, 1956, and appearing in the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch* on the same date. It reports the finding of "tombs dating back to the Third Century B.C., . . . near the battlefield of Cannae, where Hannibal crushed a Roman army" in 216 B.C. "Human remains," said the report, "believed to be those of Hannibal's soldiers were found by reforestry workers."

Interscholastic Latin Contest, 1955

Announcement has been made of the results of the *Twenty-ninth Annual Interscholastic Latin Contest*, among Midwest Jesuit High Schools, held on December 6, 1955.

First place was won by Peter Wagner, Loyola High School, Chicago; second, by Michael DeHaemer, Rockhurst High School, Kansas City, Missouri; third, by Jerome Meyer, Loyola; fourth, by Robert Beiting, Saint Xavier High School,

Cincinnati; *fifth*, by Richard F. David, Saint Louis High School, Saint Louis; *sixth*, by Edward J. Heiden, Saint Louis High School; *seventh*, by Joseph Langan, Detroit High School, Detroit; *eighth*, by A. T. McDonnell, Loyola High School; *ninth*, by John Kellogg, Campion High School, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin; *tenth*, by John Murphy, Saint Ignatius High School, Chicago.

On a point basis, schools scored as follows: Loyola, 20.5; Saint Louis, 11; Rockhurst, 9; Saint Xavier, 7; Detroit, 4; Campion, 2.5; Saint Ignatius, 1.

Book Reviews

Mario Untersteiner, *The Sophists*; Translated from the Italian by Kathleen Freeman. New York, Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. xvi, 368. \$6.00.

Information about the Sophists comes largely from Plato, who often portrays them as superficial in their teaching, unsound in their reasoning, champions of neither truth nor morality. And yet Plato finds them sufficiently important to merit extended discussion; he concedes that they claim to be teachers of virtue and searchers after truth; and at times he treats them with considerable respect. It is therefore a perennial challenge to historians of philosophy to reconstruct from the scanty fragments their contributions to the history of Greek thought, and to determine their true significance.

Untersteiner's investigations of the Sophists have been comprehensive and detailed. The Italian original of the book which Miss Freeman has translated appeared in 1949. In the same year he published the first two volumes of his three-volume edition, with Italian translations and commentary, of the fragments of the Sophists. The third volume was issued in 1954. He has in addition written a number of articles on special problems relating to the Sophists.

Untersteiner believes that the Sophists, at least the more important ones, were serious and profound thinkers. Their problem, briefly stated, was that of finding some basis for truth and morality in a world where everything consists of a mixture of opposites—hot and cold, wet and dry, nature and convention, and so on. At a later date Plato solved the problem by placing the true and the good in a transcendent realm of Ideas; but the Sophists, rejecting the transcendent, sought the answer in the world of everyday experience, Protagoras in his famous dictum (which Untersteiner interprets to mean, "Man is the master of experiences"), and Gorgias in his doctrine of *κατάλογος*, or "occasion."

One cannot but admire the resourcefulness with which Untersteiner pieces together the fragments to construct imposing intellectual systems not only of Protagoras and Gorgias, but of the lesser Sophists as well. At times it seems questionable whether the conclusions he draws are really justified by the evidence; but undoubtedly he has added greatly to the understanding of the Sophists in their historical role.

Miss Freeman's translation is fluent and, so far as I checked it, accurate. She has performed a very useful service indeed in making this work available in English.

Phillip De Lacy

Washington University

Minnie Lee Barrett Shepard, *Life in the Imperial and Loyal City of Mexico in New Spain, and the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico: Dialogues by Francisco Cervantes de Salazar*, Translated, with Collotype Reproduction of Original Latin Text. Austin, University of Texas Press, 1953. Pp. vii, 113. \$7.50.

Beautifully printed and ornately bound, this book is the University of Texas's birthday gift to the University of Mexico, celebrating the latter's four hundredth anniversary in 1953. The work presents a photographic reprint of the full text of seven dialogues written in Latin in 1554 as language exercises for students at the University of Mexico, where Francisco Cervantes de Salazar was the first professor of rhetoric. There is also a full translation, very capably done, with some helpful explanatory footnotes on historical background and text interpretation. The eminent humanist Carlos Castañeda contributes a fine introduction on the origins and later adventures of these *Dialogues*, what is known about their author, and something of the context of academic life in the University of Mexico four hundred years ago, that venerable first center of higher academic culture in the New World's northern hemisphere. The original book, put out by the first commercial printer on this continent, is now extremely rare—probably because all copies fell into the hands of students with subsequent rapid demolition.

The *Dialogues* are written in good sixteenth century learned Latin, with a somewhat formal and self-conscious style reflecting the dignified grandeur of a Spanish hidalguito. Three of them describe life and scenes in Mexico City, its environs, and its University. The other four are about games imported from Spain for the training of youth—jumping ball through an iron hoop, wooden pyramids, and tennis played with bare hands for rackets. All seven are of value for obtaining an idea of the phenomenally rapid transposition of Spanish culture and customs into the New World.

For historians of New Spain, these are illuminating documents. Classics professors can find in them a few hours of urbane entertainment and perhaps of gentle musing on old-style methods of teaching Latin.

Raymond Victor Schoder, S.J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Indiana

Charles Christopher Mierow, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, by Otto of Freising and His Continuator, Rahewin; Translated and Annotated, with an Introduction with the Collaboration of Richard Emery. (*The Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*, XLIX). New York, Columbia University Press, 1953. Pp. xi, 366. \$5.50.

This work is a translation with commentary of the first two books of the *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*. The first two books, written by the Emperor's uncle, Bishop Otto of Freising, cover sketchily the events from the reign of Henry IV through that of Conrad III and then, in much greater detail, the events of the first five years of Frederick's emperorship. Otto was prevented from bringing the work to fulfillment by his death in 1158. His secretary, Rahewin, continued the biography through two more books, bringing the account of Frederick's reign down to the year 1160. Except for a few brief notes added by Rahewin, the final thirty years of the Emperor's life are left untouched.

Otto's earlier and major work, the *Two Cities*, also published in translation by Professor Mierow, was more of a philosophy of history, depicting in the tradition of Saint Augustine, "history as the working out in time, upon the world as a stage, of the conflict of the eternal principles of good and evil" (p. 5). While that work is highly interesting from an historiographical point of view, *The Deeds of Frederick* "is more valuable as a source of factual information" (p. 5).

Bishop Otto was the greater scholar and superior Latinist. Rahewin, however, is not without his merits. While his wholesale introduction of passages from earlier writers like Sallust and Josephus must make the reader wary, his insertion into the text of full copies of letters and official acts wins the gratitude of later historians. The translation by Mr. Mierow is excellently done. Along with the careful notes and bibliography, owed chiefly to Mr. Emery, this book takes its place with becoming dignity as number forty-nine in the series, *The Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*.

Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.

Saint Louis University

Sister Mary Donald, B.V.M., *Selections from Ecclesiastical Latin*. Mimeographed, Mundelein College, Chicago, n.d. Pp. 1.

This little work of seven mimeographed pages contains brief Latin selections from the books of *Genesis*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *2 Paralipomenon*, and *Isaiah* of the Old Testament, one passage from Saint John's Gospel, and the story of the martyrdom of Saint Ignatius of Antioch as told in Saint Jerome's *De Scripturis Ecclesiasticis*. The student is assisted by a running vocabulary along the right hand column, with notes at the bottom of the page. These selections are clearly intended for a student not too far advanced in the study of Latin, and may encourage some to follow up their formal study of Latin with the use at Mass of the Latin Missal.

Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.

Saint Louis University

Gisela M. A. Richter. *Greek Portraits: A Study of Their Development*. Collection Latomus, Vol. XX. Berchem-Bruxelles, 1955. Pp. 50; 10 plates, with 36 figures. 80 francs.

This important monograph (though with three misprints in title on back page) is based on the James Bryce Memorial lecture delivered at Oxford, June 1954. It may seem illogical to have it published in a *Revue d'Etudes Latines*, but no original Greek portraits, which were full size statues, have survived. We are dependent on Roman copies, mostly busts

The Roman personality clothes in sculptors work that live," a

Excuse Cred

The Greek of the head orators were in bedrooms as Miss R. She writes authoritative up to date. experience

Homer, Pindar, Euripides, traits were realistic, even the Pompeii, told by Pli

statues can favorite at or choliam Norton's other and other name the s interprets the reconstruct a better at Miss Richter (found at sister is a copy of a scribed but Vatican but wise men

The ind served in in Copenhagen seated) is "Pindar,"

series of in phers from Memphis markable Copenhagen is called " was found statue was der antique cl. now J. du Serape et d'Arche

I now h of the sta unpublished with the Fraser in that the s hands cla A-chaeloa been remo in AJA 5 Richter (Seneca he not cited tophanes, called Ho Philemon, Lucratiu important 1950), to (1955) 2 take of e not quot Bieber, 2 (1955) 52 Bildnispl "Das Me

The Romans did not understand the Greek expression of personality in the body and in drapery, or the psychology of clothes in the way the Greeks did. Most of the Roman sculptors were Greeks; and when the Romans wanted good art they went to the Greeks "who cut from marble faces that live," as Vergil (*Aen.* 6.847-848) says:

Excurrent alii spirantia mollius aera
Credo equidem, vivos ducent de marmore volutus.

The Greeks focussed their attention on the head. Copies of the heads of Greek statues of philosophers, poets, and orators were placed in libraries and private houses, especially in bedrooms; (Plin. *HN* 35.2—not the beginning of book five, as Miss Richter says; Philostr. *VS* 521). Miss Richter has published more than any other scholar on Greek sculpture. She writes me the good news that she hopes to finish an authoritative corpus of Greek portraits, bringing Bernoulli up to date. It gives a lover of Greek literature an inspiring experience to find himself face to face with portraits of Homer, Pindar, Anacreon, Pericles, Sophocles, Hippocrates, Euripides, Demosthenes, Epicurus, and others. Greek portraits were generally ideal, whereas Roman portraits were realistic, even showing a wart on the face, as in the case of the Pompeian banker, L. Caecilius Jucundus. But we are told by Pliny (*NH* 34.83) that Bupalus and Athenis made statues caricaturing the ugliness of Hipponax, that spiteful favorite at Ephesus *cafés chantants* who invented the scazon or choliambic meter. Miss Richter does not cite Richard Norton's good article on "The Art of Portraiture," in *Bernini and Other Studies* (New York 1914) 57-92. She does not name the satyr play by Aeschylus, the *Isthmiaeae*, where she interprets *eidolon* as a "figure or head"; see my summary of the reconstruction (*CB* 32 [Nov. 1955] 7) by Snell, who is a better authority on this play than Lobel. I am pleased that Miss Richter considers the impetuous bust of Themistocles (found at Ostia) as early. Her knowledge of anatomy (her sister is a sculptor) makes it certain that this is a faithful copy of a portrait of ca. 460 B.C. Miss Richter mentions inscribed busts of Pericles in the British Museum and in the Vatican but not that in Munich nor the busts of the seven wise men in the Vatican.

The individualised fifth century portrait of Anacreon preserved in a herm in the Conservatori Palace and in a statue in Copenhagen (there really are two, one standing and one seated) is a Roman copy. Picard would call this type "Pindar," because of the similar statues in the semi-circular series of inscribed portrait bust statues of poets and philosophers from Homer to Plato, found in the Serapeum at Memphis (*Mon. Piot* 46 [1952] 5-17), one of the most remarkable finds of modern times. In the article cited, the Copenhagen statue, no. 430, is illustrated (p. 17, fig. 9) and is called "Pindar." In note 1, Picard says that this statue was found with another, now in Athens, and that this other statue was a standing "Anacreon"; (Shefold, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker* [Basel 1943] 65; cf. now J. P. Lauer et Ch. Picard, "Les statues Ptolemaïques du Serapeion de Memphis," *Publications de l'Institut d'Art et d'Archéologie de l'Université de Paris III* [Paris 1955]).

I now have an unpublished bust of Aeschines, like the head of the statue in Naples, but the bust of Demosthenes is not unpublished, as Miss Richter says. It was published at length with the same illustrations (figs. 27, 28) by the late A. D. Fraser in *AJA* 41 (1937) 212-216. Miss Richter does know that the statue of Demosthenes should now be restored with hands clasped, even if she shows no illustration; see *Art and Archaeology* 1 (1914) 49. The hands with scroll have now been removed from the Vatican statue. The head I published in *AJA* 59 (1955) fig. 48, I now think is of Diogenes. Miss Richter (p. 30) revives Miss Bieber's theory that the so-called Seneca head (of which I have the only example in America, not cited by Miss Bieber or Miss Richter) represents Aristophanes, even though he was bald. This recently has been called Homer, Hesiod, Hipponax, Archilochus, Pindar, Aesop, Philémon, Callimachus, Epicharmus, Eratosthenes, and even Lucretius. Miss Richter does not mention Bertil Strandman's important book on *The Pseudo-Seneca Problem* (Stockholm 1950), to which I refer with much other literature in *AJA* 59 (1955) 25. On the Menander-Vergil problem and "the mistake of eminent scholars," cf. my monograph, cited op. cit., not quoted by Carpenter or Miss Richter. Cf. now Miss Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (New York 1955) 52-54. See also now G. Hafner, *Späthellenistische Bildnisplastik* (Berlin 1954) 77-78, 93-102, Appendix II, "Das Menander-Vergil Problem."

Miss Richter agrees with me, Miss Bieber, and most other scholars that this type (represented by an earlier bust than Vergil's time in my collection) is of Menander and not of Vergil, as Crome and Carpenter and very few others believe. My head is very Greek and much earlier than Vergil. Miss Richter also takes no account of the popular modern theory of Egyptologists, especially of Bernard Bothmer, that the emphasis on portraiture is due to Egypt.

The book has several misprints; thus p. 21 "looked" for "looked"; p. 29 "Scheffold" for "Scheffold"; p. 32 "Ritratti" for "Ritratti"; p. 49 "Epiouros" for "Epikouros." "Mausolos" is the usual spelling, but on pp. 18, 27, 30, and *passim*, Miss Richter has "Maussolos." He spelt his own name on his own coins (I have two) "Maussollos." Why not spell his name as he did himself?

Do not let my strictures and additions give the notion that this is not a great monograph full of important material.

David Moore Robinson

University of Mississippi

Robert Muth, *Träger der Lebenskraft: Ausscheidungen des Organismus im Volksglauben der Antike*. Vienna, Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, 1954. Pp. xiii, 184. \$3.20.

According to the author, primitive men as well as those of more cultural attainments are intrigued by the mystery of life. Among the primitives we find a widespread belief in the efficacy of the various excrements of the body as *Träger der Lebenskraft*, "bearers of vital forces." Such an opinion was fairly prevalent in antiquity as well. In this volume Muth has gathered together the extant evidence for a belief on the part of the Greeks and Romans in the vital powers of the three most common excrements of the living organism—*Speichel, Harn, und Kot*. He considers them under three aspects—as magical devices, as popular medicines, and the role which they played in the legends of the gods. The book should prove to be of some value and interest to specialists in the history of medicine and comparative religions. It could also produce a few thrills of horror in a jaded reader who needs some sort of shock treatment. We have for example the remedy suggested by Sextus Placitus 9a.12: *Ad idropicos. Canis rabidi id, quod sub lingua habet, acceptum et potatum cum aqua calida vel ex vino mirifice sanat* (p. 86). But I think that the statement printed on the jacket to the book to the effect that "die zahlreichen Interpretationen . . . sind für die antike Literaturwissenschaft von Wichtigkeit und Interesse" is at least optimistic.

M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.

Saint Stanislaus Seminary,
Florissant, Missouri

Three Books on Antiquities: William A. Smith, *Ancient Education*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. xii, 309. \$3.75. W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Boston, Beacon Press, 1955. Pp. xiv, 388. \$1.75 (paperback edition). Clement Robichon and Alexandre Varille, *Eternal Egypt: Translated by Laetitia Gifford*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. xv, 144 illustrations. \$6.00.

Ancient Education traces the cultural and educational development of seven early peoples—the Mesopotamians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Chinese, the Greeks, the Romans, and the Hebrews. In a final chapter the education of children in contemporary nonliterate societies is discussed. The book contains a considerable amount of useful information not readily found in a single volume, but it is drawn entirely from secondary sources written in English, and not all by any means of a very weighty character. In discussing Greek education, for example, the author, former professor of education at U.C.L.A., relies heavily upon Will Durant's *Life of Greece* and seems completely unaware of Jaeger's *Paideia*. He believes that "an analysis of the educational proposals set forth by Plato in the Republic and the Laws and by Aristotle in the Ethics and the Politics is beyond the scope of this discussion" (p. 144), that "the fatal predicament of the Romans—as of the Greeks before them—was of course that they had no real notion of social science" (p. 192), that the "constant effort to know unchanging reality—the 'elements,' the 'truth' the 'moral law,' the 'absolute' . . . promoted the formulation of systems of thought which explained the universe, defined the moral law, and sought first principles. But it did not promote a continuous expansion of factual information about man and his world" (p. 192, quoted from Turner, *Great Cultural Traditions*). An apology must of course be found for such an unpragmatic investigation as that which was undertaken in this book, and it is at hand: "The history of education is of inestimable value in social engineering"